arXiv:1602.04995v3 [cs.CG] 30 Aug 2016

# On the Density of non-Simple 3-Planar Graphs*

Michael A. Bekos[1], Michael Kaufmann[1], Chrysanthi N. Raftopoulou[2]

[1] Institut für Informatik, Universität Tübingen, Tübingen, Germany
{bekos,mk}@informatik.uni-tuebingen.de
[2] School of Applied Mathematics & Physical Sciences, NTUA, Athens, Greece
crisraft@mail.ntua.gr

**Abstract.** A *k-planar graph* is a graph that can be drawn in the plane such that every edge is crossed at most $k$ times. For $k \leq 4$, Pach and Tóth [19] proved a bound of $(k+3)(n-2)$ on the total number of edges of a $k$-planar graph, which is tight for $k = 1, 2$. For $k = 3$, the bound of $6n-12$ has been improved to $\frac{11}{2}n-11$ in [18] and has been shown to be optimal up to an additive constant for simple graphs. In this paper, we prove that the bound of $\frac{11}{2}n-11$ edges also holds for non-simple 3-planar graphs that admit drawings in which non-homotopic parallel edges and self-loops are allowed. Based on this result, a characterization of *optimal* 3*-planar graphs* (that is, 3-planar graphs with $n$ vertices and exactly $\frac{11}{2}n-11$ edges) might be possible, as to the best of our knowledge the densest known simple 3-planar is not known to be optimal.

## 1 Introduction

Planar graphs play an important role in graph drawing and visualization, as the avoidance of crossings and occlusions is central objective in almost all applications [9,17]. The theory of planar graphs [14] could be very nicely applied and used for developing great layout algorithms [12,21,22] based on the planarity concepts. Unfortunately, real-world graphs are usually not planar despite of their sparsity. With this background, an initiative has formed in recent years to develop a suitable theory for *nearly planar graphs*, that is, graphs with various restrictions on their crossings, such as limitations on the number of crossings per edge (e.g., $k$-planar graphs [20]), avoidance of local crossing configurations (e.g., quasi planar graphs [2], fan-crossing free graphs [8], fan-planar graphs [16]) or restrictions on the crossing angles (e.g., RAC graphs [10], LAC graphs [11]). For precise definitions, we refer to the literature mentioned above.

The most prominent is clearly the concept of $k$-planar graphs, namely graphs that allow drawings in the plane such that each edge is crossed at most $k$ times by other edges. The simplest case $k = 1$, i.e., 1-planar graphs [20], has been subject of intensive research in the past and it is quite well understood, see e.g. [4,5,6,7,13,19]. For $k \geq 2$, the picture is much less clear. Only few papers on special cases appeared, see e.g., [3,15].

* This work has been supported by DFG grant Ka812/17-1.

Pach and Tóth's paper [19] stands out and contributed a lot to the understanding of nearly planar graphs. The paper considers the number of edges in simple $k$-planar graphs for general $k$. Note the well-known bound of $3n-6$ edges for planar graphs deducible from Euler's formula. For small $k = 1, 2, 3$ and 4, bounds of $4n-8$, $5n-10$, $6n-12$ and $7n-14$ respectively, are proven which are tight for $k = 1$ and $k = 2$. This sequence seems to suggest a bound of $O(kn)$ for general $k$, but Pach and Tóth also gave an upper bound of $4.1208\sqrt{k}n$. Unfortunately, this bound is still quite large even for medium $k$ (for $k = 9$, it gives $12.36n$). Meanwhile for $k = 3$ and $k = 4$, the bounds above have been improved to $5.5n-11$ and $6n-12$ in [18] and [1], respectively. In this paper, we prove that the bound on the number of edges for $k = 3$ also holds for non-simple 3-planar graphs that do not contain homotopic parallel edges and homotopic self-loops. Our extension required substantially different approaches and relies more on geometric techniques than the more combinatorial ones given in [18] and [1]. We believe that it might also be central for the characterization of *optimal* 3-planar graphs (that is, 3-planar graphs with $n$ vertices and exactly $\frac{11}{2}n - 11$ edges), since the densest known simple 3-planar graph has only $\frac{11n}{2} - 15$ edges and does not reach the known bound.

The remaining of this paper is structured as follows: Some definitions and preliminaries are given in Section 2. In Sections 3 and 4, we give significant insights in structural properties of 3-planar graphs in order to prove that 3-planar graphs on $n$ vertices cannot have more than $\frac{11}{2}n-11$ edges. We conclude in Section 5 with open problems.

## 2 Preliminaries

A *drawing* of a graph $G$ is a representation of $G$ in the plane, where the vertices of $G$ are represented by distinct points and its edges by Jordan curves joining the corresponding pairs of points, so that:(i) no edge passes through a vertex different from its endpoints, (ii) no edge crosses itself and (iii) no two edges meet tangentially. In the case where $G$ has multi-edges, we will further assume that both the bounded and the unbounded closed regions defined by any pair of self-loops or parallel edges of $G$ contain at least one vertex of $G$ in their interior. Hence, the drawing of $G$ has no *homotopic* edges. In the following when referring to 3-planar graphs we will mean that non-homotopic edges are allowed in the corresponding drawings. We call such graphs *non-simple*.

Following standard naming conventions, we refer to a 3-planar graph with $n$ vertices and maximum possible number of edges as *optimal* 3*-planar*. Let $H$ be an optimal 3-planar graph on $n$ vertices together with a corresponding 3-planar drawing $\Gamma(H)$. Let also $H_p$ be a subgraph of $H$ with the largest number of edges, such that in the drawing of $H_p$ (that is inherited from $\Gamma(H)$) no two edges cross each other. We call $H_p$ a *maximal planar substructure* of $H$. Among all possible optimal 3-planar graphs on $n$ vertices, let $G = (V, E)$ be the one with the following two properties:(a) its maximal planar substructure, say $G_p = (V, E_p)$, has maximum number of edges among all possible planar substructures of all




**Fig. 1.** (a) Illustration of a non-simple face $\{v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_7\}$; $v_6$ is identified with $v_4$. The sticks from $v_1$ and $v_2$ are short, while the one from $v_7$ is long. All other edge segments are middle-parts. (b) The case, where two triangles of type $(3, 0, 0)$ are associated to the same triangle.

optimal 3-planar graphs, (b) the number of crossings in the drawing of $G$ is minimized over all optimal 3-planar graphs subject to (a). We refer to $G$ as *crossing-minimal optimal 3-planar graph*.

With slight abuse of notation, let $G - G_p$ be obtained from $G$ by removing only the edges of $G_p$ and let $e$ be an edge of $G - G_p$. Since $G_p$ is maximal, edge $e$ must cross at least one edge of $G_p$. We refer to the part of $e$ between an endpoint of $e$ and the nearest crossing with an edge of $G_p$ as *stick*. The parts of $e$ between two consecutive crossings with $G_p$ are called *middle parts*. Clearly, $e$ consists of exactly 2 sticks and 0, 1, or 2 middle parts. A stick of $e$ lies completely in a face of $G_p$ and crosses at most two other edges of $G - G_p$ and an edge of this particular face. A stick of $e$ is called *short*, if there is a walk along the face boundary from the endpoint of the stick to the nearest crossing point with $G_p$, which contains only one other vertex of the face boundary. Otherwise, the stick of $e$ is called *long*; see Figure 1a. A middle part of $e$ also lies in a face of $G_p$. We say that $e$ *passes through* a face of $G_p$, if there exists a middle part of $e$ that completely lies in the interior of this particular face. We refer to a middle part of an edge that crosses consecutive edges of a face of $G_p$ as *short middle part*. Otherwise, we call it *far middle part*.

Let $\mathcal{F}_s = \{v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_s\}$ be a face of $G_p$ with $s \geq 3$. The order of the vertices (and subsequently the order of the edges) of $\mathcal{F}_s$ is determined by a walk around the boundary of $\mathcal{F}_s$ in clockwise direction. Since $\mathcal{F}_s$ is not necessarily simple, a vertex (or an edge, respectively) may appear more than once in this order; see Figure 1a. We say that $\mathcal{F}_s$ is of type $(\tau_1, \tau_2, \ldots, \tau_s)$ if for each $i = 1, 2, \ldots, s$ vertex $v_i$ is incident to $\tau_i$ sticks of $\mathcal{F}_s$ that lie between $(v_{i-1}, v_i)$ and $(v_i, v_{i+1})$[3].

**Lemma 1 (Pach and Tóth [19]).** *A triangular face of $G_p$ contains at most 3 sticks.*

*Proof.* Consider a triangular face $\mathcal{T}$ of $G_p$ of type $(\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3)$. Clearly, $\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3 \leq 3$, as otherwise an edge of $G_p$ has more than three crossings. Since a stick of $\mathcal{T}$ cannot cross more than two other sticks of $\mathcal{T}$, it follows that $\tau_1 + \tau_2 + \tau_3 \leq 3$. □

[3] In the remainder of the paper, all indices are subject to $(mod\ s) + 1$.

## 3 The Density of non-Simple 3-Planar Graphs

Let $G = (V, E)$ be a crossing-minimal optimal 3-planar graph with $n$ vertices drawn in the plane. Let also $G_p = (V, E_p)$ be the maximal planar substructure of $G$. In this section, we will prove that $G$ cannot have more than $\frac{11n}{2} - 11$ edges, assuming that $G_p$ is fully triangulated, i.e., $|E_p| = 3n - 6$. This assumption will be proved in Section 4. Next, we prove that the number of triangular faces of $G_p$ with exactly 3 sticks cannot be larger than those with at most 2 sticks.

**Lemma 2.** *We can uniquely associate each triangular face of $G_p$ with 3 sticks to a neighboring triangular face of $G_p$ with at most 2 sticks.*

*Proof.* Let $\mathcal{T} = \{v_1, v_2, v_3\}$ be a triangular face of $G_p$. By Lemma 1, we have to consider three types for $\mathcal{T}$: $(3, 0, 0)$, $(2, 1, 0)$ and $(1, 1, 1)$.

- $\mathcal{T}$ *is of type* $(3, 0, 0)$*:* Since $v_1$ is incident to 3 sticks of $\mathcal{T}$, edge $(v_2, v_3)$ is crossed three times. Let $\mathcal{T}'$ be the triangular face of $G_p$ neighboring $\mathcal{T}$ along $(v_2, v_3)$. We have to consider two cases:(a) one of the sticks of $\mathcal{T}$ ends at a corner of $\mathcal{T}'$, and (b) none of the sticks of $\mathcal{T}$ ends at a corner of $\mathcal{T}'$. In Case (a), the two remaining sticks of $\mathcal{T}$ might use the same or different sides of $\mathcal{T}'$ to exit it. In both subcases, it is not difficult to see that $\mathcal{T}'$ can have at most two sticks. In Case (b), we again have to consider two subcases, depending on whether all sticks of $\mathcal{T}$ use the same side of $\mathcal{T}'$ to pass through it or two different ones. In the former case, it is not difficult to see that $\mathcal{T}'$ cannot have any stick, while in the later $\mathcal{T}'$ can have at most one stick. In all aforementioned cases, we associate $\mathcal{T}$ with $\mathcal{T}'$.
- $\mathcal{T}$ *is of type* $(2, 1, 0)$*:* Since $v_2$ is incident to one stick of $\mathcal{T}$, edge $(v_1, v_3)$ is crossed at least once. We associate $\mathcal{T}$ with the triangular face $\mathcal{T}'$ of $G_p$ neighboring $\mathcal{T}$ along $(v_1, v_3)$. Since the stick of $\mathcal{T}$ that is incident to $v_2$ has three crossings in $\mathcal{T}$, $\mathcal{T}'$ has no sticks emanating from $v_1$ or $v_3$. In particular, $\mathcal{T}'$ can have at most one additional stick emanating from its third vertex.
- $\mathcal{T}$ *is of type* $(1, 1, 1)$*:* This actually cannot occur. Indeed, if $\mathcal{T}$ is of type $(1, 1, 1)$, then all sticks of $\mathcal{T}$ have already three crossings each. Hence, the three triangular faces adjacent to $\mathcal{T}$ define a 6-gon in $G_p$, which contains only six interior edges. So, we can easily remove them and replace them with 8 interior edges (see, e.g., Figure 1b), contradicting thus the optimality of $G$.

Note that our analysis also holds for non-simple triangular faces. We now show that the assignment is unique. This holds for triangular faces of type $(2, 1, 0)$, since a triangular face that is associated with one of type $(2, 1, 0)$ cannot contain two sides each with two crossings, which implies that it cannot be associated with another triangular face with three sticks. This leaves only the case that two $(3, 0, 0)$ triangles are associated with the same triangle $\mathcal{T}'$ (see, e.g., the triangle with the gray-colored edges in Figure 1b). In this case, there exists another triangular face (bottommost in Figure 1b), which has exactly two sticks because of 3-planarity. In addition, this face cannot be associated with some other triangular face. Hence, one of the two type-$(3, 0, 0)$ triangular faces associated with $\mathcal{T}'$ can be assigned to this triangular face instead resolving the conflict. □

We are now ready to prove the main theorem of this section.

**Theorem 1.** *A 3-planar graph of $n$ vertices has at most $\frac{11}{2}n - 11$ edges, which is a tight bound.*

*Proof.* Let $t_i$ be the number of triangular faces of $G_p$ with exactly $i$ sticks, $0 \leq i \leq 3$. The argument starts by counting the number of triangular faces of $G_p$ with exactly 3 sticks. From Lemma 2, we conclude that the number $t_3$ of triangular faces of $G_p$ with exactly 3 sticks is at most as large as the number of triangular faces of $G_p$ with 0, 1 or 2 sticks. Hence $t_3 \leq t_0 + t_1 + t_2$. We conclude that $t_3 \leq t_p/2$, where $t_p$ denotes the number of triangular faces in $G_p$, since $t_0+t_1+t_2+t_3 = t_p$. Note that by Euler's formula $t_p = 2n-4$. Hence, $t_3 \leq n-2$. Thus, we have: $|E| - |E_p| = (t_1 + 2t_2 + 3t_3)/2 = (t_1 + t_2 + t_3) + (t_3 - t_1)/2 = (t_p - t_0) + (t_3 - t_1)/2 \leq t_p + t_3/2 \leq 5t_p/4$. So, the total number of edges of $G$ is at most: $|E| \leq |E_p| + 5t_p/4 \leq 3n-6+5(2n-4)/4 = 11n/2-11$. In Appendix A we prove that our bound is tight by a construction similar to the one of Pach et al. [18]. □

## 4 The Density of the Planar Substructure

Let $G = (V, E)$ be a crossing-minimal optimal 3-planar graph with $n$ vertices drawn in the plane. Let also $G_p = (V, E_p)$ be the maximal planar substructure of $G$. In this section, we will prove that $G_p$ is fully triangulated, i.e., $|E_p| = 3n - 6$ (see Theorem 2). To do so, we will explore several structural properties of $G_p$ (see Lemmas 3-13), assuming that $G_p$ has at least one non-triangular face, say $\mathcal{F}_s = \{v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_s\}$ with $s \geq 4$. In the first observations, we do not require that $G_p$ is connected. This is proved in Lemma 6. Recall that in general $\mathcal{F}_s$ is not necessarily simple, which means that a vertex may appear more than once along $\mathcal{F}_s$. Our goal is to contradict either the *optimality* of $G$ (that is, the fact that $G$ contains the maximum number of edges among all 3-planar graphs with $n$ vertices) or the *maximality* of $G_p$ (that is, the fact that $G_p$ has the maximum number of edges among all planar substructures of all optimal 3-planar graphs with $n$ vertices) or the *crossing minimality* of $G$ (that is, the fact that $G$ has the minimum number of crossings subject to the size of the planar substructure).

**Lemma 3.** *Let $\mathcal{F}_s = \{v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_s\}$, $s \geq 4$ be a non-triangular face of $G_p$. Then, each stick of $\mathcal{F}_s$ is crossed at least once within $\mathcal{F}_s$.*

*Proof (Sketch).* Assume to the contrary that there exists a stick of $\mathcal{F}_s$ that is not crossed within $\mathcal{F}_s$. W.l.o.g. let $(v_1, v_1')$ be the edge containing this stick and assume that $(v_1, v_1')$ emanates from vertex $v_1$ and leads to vertex $v_1'$ by crossing the edge $(v_i, v_{i+1})$ of $\mathcal{F}_s$. We initially prove that $i + 1 = s$. Next, we show that there exist two edges $e_1$ and $e_2$ which cross $(v_i, v_{i+1})$ and are not sticks emanating from $v_1$. The desired contradiction follows from the observation that we can remove edges $e_1$, $e_2$ and $(v_1, v_1')$ from $G$ and replace them with the chord $(v_1, v_{s-1})$ and two additional edges that are both sticks either at $v_1$ or at $v_s$. In

this way, a new graph is obtained, whose maximal planar substructure has more edges than $G_p$, which contradicts the maximality of $G_p$. The detailed proof is given in Appendix B. □

**Lemma 4.** *Let $\mathcal{F}_s = \{v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_s\}$, $s \geq 4$ be a non-triangular face of $G_p$. Then, each middle part of $\mathcal{F}_s$ is short, i.e., it crosses consecutive edges of $\mathcal{F}_s$.*

*Proof (Sketch).* For a proof by contradiction, assume that $(u, u')$ is an edge that defines a middle part of $\mathcal{F}_s$ which crosses two non-consecutive edges of $\mathcal{F}_s$, say w.l.o.g. $(v_1, v_2)$ and $(v_i, v_{i+1})$, where $i \neq 2$ and $i+1 \neq s$. We distinguish two main cases. Either $(u, u')$ is not involved in crossings in the interior of $\mathcal{F}_s$ or $(u, u')$ is crossed by an edge, say $e$, within $\mathcal{F}_s$. In both cases, it is possible to lead to a contradiction to the maximality of $G_p$; refer to Appendix B for more details. □

**Lemma 5.** *Let $\mathcal{F}_s = \{v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_s\}$, $s \geq 4$ be a non-triangular face of $G_p$. Then, each stick of $\mathcal{F}_s$ is short.*

*Proof.* Assume for a contradiction that there exists a far stick. Let w.l.o.g. $(v_1, v_1')$ be the edge containing this stick and assume that $(v_1, v_1')$ emanates from vertex $v_1$ and leads to vertex $v_1'$ by crossing the edge $(v_i, v_{i+1})$ of $\mathcal{F}_s$, where $i \neq 2$ and $i + 1 \neq s$. If we can replace $(v_1, v_1')$ either with chord $(v_1, v_i)$ or with chord $(v_1, v_{i+1})$, then the maximal planar substructure of the derived graph would have more edges than $G_p$; contradicting the maximality of $G_p$. Thus, there exist two edges, say $e_1$ and $e_2$, that cross $(v_i, v_{i+1})$ to the left and to the right of $(v_1, v_1')$, respectively; see Figure 2a. By Lemma 3, edge $(v_1, v_1')$ is crossed by at least one other edge, say $e$, inside $\mathcal{F}_s$. Note that by 3-planarity edge $(v_1, v_1')$ might also be crossed by a second edge, say $e'$, inside $\mathcal{F}_s$. Suppose first, that $(v_1, v_1')$ has a single crossing inside $\mathcal{F}_s$. To cope with this case, we propose two alternatives:(a) replace $e_1$ with chord $(v_1, v_{i+1})$ and make vertex $v_{i+1}$ an endpoint of $e$, or (b) replace $e_2$ with chord $(v_1, v_i)$ and make vertex $v_i$ an endpoint of both $e$; see Figures 2b and 2c, respectively. Since $e$ and $(v_i, v_{i+1})$ are not homotopic, it follows that at least one of the two alternatives can be applied, contradicting the maximality of $G_p$.

Consider now the case where $(v_1, v_1')$ has two crossings inside $\mathcal{F}_s$, with edges $e$ and $e'$. Similarly to the previous case, we propose two alternatives:(a) replace $e_1$ with chord $(v_1, v_{i+1})$ and make vertex $v_{i+1}$ an endpoint of both $e$ and $e'$, or (b) replace $e_2$ with chord $(v_1, v_i)$ and make vertex $v_i$ an endpoint of both $e$ and $e'$; see Figures 2d and 2e, respectively. Note that in both alternatives the maximal planar substructure of the derived graph has more edges than $G_p$, contradicting the maximality of $G_p$. Since $e$ and $e'$ are not homotopic, it follows that one of the two alternatives is always applicable, as long as, $e$ and $e'$ are not simultaneously sticks from $v_i$ and $v_{i+1}$, respectively; see Figure 2f. In this scenario, both alternatives would lead to a situation, where $(v_i, v_{i+1})$ has two homotopic copies. To cope with this case, we observe that $e$, $e'$ and $(v_1, v_1')$ are three mutually crossing edges inside $\mathcal{F}_s$. We proceed by removing from $G$ edges $e_1$ and $e_2$, which we replace by $(v_1, v_i)$ and $(v_1, v_{i+1})$; see Figure 2g. In the derived graph the maximal planar substructure contains more edges than $G_p$ (in particular, edges $(v_1, v_i)$ and $(v_1, v_{i+1})$), contradicting its maximality. □




**Fig. 2.** Different configurations used in the proof of Lemma 5.

**Lemma 6.** *The planar substructure $G_p$ of a crossing-minimal optimal 3-planar graph $G$ is connected.*

*Proof.* Assume to the contrary that the maximum planar substructure $G_p$ of $G$ is not connected and let $G'_p$ be a connected component of $G_p$. Since $G$ is connected, there is an edge of $G - G_p$ that bridges $G'_p$ with $G_p - G'_p$. By definition, this edge is either a stick or a passing through edge for the common face of $G'_p$ and $G - G'_p$. In both cases, it has to be short (by Lemmas 4 and 5); a contradiction. □

In the next two lemmas, we consider the case where a non-triangular face $\mathcal{F}_s = \{v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_s\}$, $s \geq 4$ of $G_p$ has no sticks. Let $br(\mathcal{F}_s)$ and $\overline{br}(\mathcal{F}_s)$ be the set of bridges and non-bridges of $\mathcal{F}_s$, respectively (in Figure 1a, edge $(v_4, v_5)$ is a bridge). In the absence of sticks, a passing through edge of $\mathcal{F}_s$ *originates* from one of its end-vertices, crosses an edge of $\overline{br}(\mathcal{F}_s)$ to *enter* $\mathcal{F}_s$, passes through $\mathcal{F}_s$ (possibly by defining two middle parts, if it crosses an edge of $br(\mathcal{F}_s)$), crosses another edge of $\overline{br}(\mathcal{F}_s)$ to *exit* $\mathcal{F}_s$ and *terminates* to its other end-vertex. We *associate* the edge of $\overline{br}(\mathcal{F}_s)$ that is used by the passing through edge to enter (exit) $\mathcal{F}_s$ with the origin (terminal) of this passing through edge. Let $\overline{s_b}$ and $s_b$ be the number of edges in $\overline{br}(\mathcal{F}_s)$ and $br(\mathcal{F}_s)$, respectively. Let also $\widehat{s_b}$ be the number of edges of $\overline{br}(\mathcal{F}_s)$ that are crossed by no passing through edge of $\mathcal{F}_s$. Clearly, $\widehat{s_b} \leq \overline{s_b}$ and $s = \overline{s_b} + 2s_b$.

**Lemma 7.** *Let $\mathcal{F}_s = \{v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_s\}$, $s \geq 4$ be a non-triangular face of $G_p$ that has no sticks. Then, the number $\widehat{s_b}$ of non-bridges of $\mathcal{F}_s$ that are crossed by no passing through edge of $\mathcal{F}_s$ is strictly less than half the number $\overline{s_b}$ of of non-bridges of $\mathcal{F}_s$, that is, $\widehat{s_b} < \frac{\overline{s_b}}{2}$.*

*Proof.* For a proof by contradiction assume that $\widehat{s_b} \geq \frac{\overline{s_b}}{2}$. Since at most $\frac{\overline{s_b}}{2}$ edges of $\mathcal{F}_s$ can be crossed (each of which at most three times) and each passing through edge of $\mathcal{F}_s$ crosses two edges of $\overline{br}(\mathcal{F}_s)$, it follows that $|pt(\mathcal{F}_s)| \leq \lfloor \frac{3\overline{s_b}}{4} \rfloor$, where




**Fig. 3.** Different configurations used in Lemma 9.

$pt(\mathcal{F}_s)$ denotes the set of passing through edges of $\mathcal{F}_s$. To obtain a contradiction, we remove from $G$ all edges that pass through $\mathcal{F}_s$ and we introduce $2s-6$ edges $\{(v_1, v_i) : \ 2 < i < s\} \cup \{(v_i, v_i + 2) : \ 2 \leq i \leq s-2\}$ that lie completely in the interior of $\mathcal{F}_s$. This simple operation will lead to a larger graph (and therefore to a contradiction to the optimality of $G$) or to a graph of the same size but with larger planar substructure (and therefore to a contradiction to the maximality of $G_p$) as long as $s > 4$. For $s = 4$, we need a different argument. By Lemma 4, we may assume that all three passing through edges of $\mathcal{F}_s$ cross two consecutive edges of $\mathcal{F}_s$, say w.l.o.g. $(v_1, v_2)$ and $(v_2, v_3)$. This implies that chord $(v_1, v_3)$ can be safely added to $G$; a contradiction to the optimality of $G$. □

**Lemma 8.** *Let $\mathcal{F}_s = \{v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_s\}$, $s \geq 4$ be a non-triangular face of $G_p$. Then, $\mathcal{F}_s$ has at least one stick.*

*Proof (Sketch).* For a proof by contradiction, assume that $\mathcal{F}_s$ has no sticks. By Lemma 7, it follows that there exist at least two incident edges of $\overline{br}(\mathcal{F}_s)$ that are crossed by passing through edges of $\mathcal{F}_s$, say w.l.o.g. $(v_s, v_1)$ and $(v_1, v_2)$. Note that these two edges are not bridges of $\mathcal{F}_s$. If $s + \widehat{s_b} + 2s_b \geq 6$, then as in the proof of Lemma 7, it is possible to construct a graph that is larger than $G$ or of equal size as $G$ but with larger planar substructure. The same holds when $s + \widehat{s_b} + 2s_b = 5$ (that is, $s = 5$ and $\widehat{s_b} = s_b = 0$ or $s = 4$, $\widehat{s_b} = 1$ and $s_b = 0$). Both cases, contradict either the optimality of $G$ or the maximality of $G_p$. The case where $s + \widehat{s_b} + 2s_b = 4$ is slightly more involved; refer to Appendix B. □

By Lemma 5, all sticks of $\mathcal{F}_s$ are short. A stick $(v_i, v_i')$ of $\mathcal{F}_s$ is called *right*, if it crosses edge $(v_{i+1}, v_{i+2})$ of $\mathcal{F}_s$. Otherwise, stick $(v_i, v_i')$ is called *left*. Two sticks are called *opposite*, if one is left and the other one is right.

**Lemma 9.** *Let $\mathcal{F}_s = \{v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_s\}$, $s \geq 4$ be a non-triangular face of $G_p$. Then, $\mathcal{F}_s$ has not three mutually crossing sticks.*

*Proof.* Suppose to the contrary that there exist three mutually crossing sticks of $\mathcal{F}_s$ and let $e_i$, for $i = 1, 2, 3$ be the edges containing these sticks. W.l.o.g. we assume that at least two of them are right sticks, say $e_1$ and $e_2$. Let $e_1 = (v_1, v_1')$. Then, $e_2 = (v_2, v_2')$; see Figure 3a. Since $e_1$, $e_2$ and $e_3$ mutually cross, $e_3$ can only contain a left stick. By Lemma 5 its endpoint on $\mathcal{F}_s$ is $v_3$ or $v_4$. The first case is illustrated in Figure 3b. Observe that $(v_1, v_2)$ of $\mathcal{F}_s$ is only crossed by $e_3$.




**Fig. 4.** Different configurations used in Lemma 11.

Indeed, if there was another edge crossing $(v_1, v_2)$, then it would also cross $e_1$ or $e_2$, both of which have three crossings. Hence, $e_3$ can be replaced with $(v_1, v_3)$; see Figure 3c. The maximal planar substructure of the derived graph would have more edges than $G_p$, contradicting the maximality of $G_p$. The case where $v_4$ is the endpoint of $e_3$ on $\mathcal{F}_s$ is illustrated in Figure 3e. Suppose that there exists an edge crossing $(v_2, v_3)$ of $\mathcal{F}_s$ to the left of $e_3$. This edge should also cross $e_2$ or $e_3$, which is not possible since both edges have three crossings. So, we can replace $e_3$ with chord $(v_2, v_4)$ as in Figure 3e, contradicting the maximality of $G_p$. □

**Lemma 10.** *Let $\mathcal{F}_s = \{v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_s\}$, $s \geq 4$ be a non-triangular face of $G_p$. Then, each stick of $\mathcal{F}_s$ is crossed exactly once within $\mathcal{F}_s$.*

*Proof (Sketch).* The detailed proof is given in Appendix B. By Lemma 3, each stick of $\mathcal{F}_s$ is crossed at least once within $\mathcal{F}_s$. So, the proof is given by contradiction either to the optimality of $G$ or to the maximality of $G_p$, assuming the existence of a stick of $\mathcal{F}_s$ that is crossed twice within $\mathcal{F}_s$, say by edges $e_1$ and $e_2$. Note that by 3-planarity a stick of $\mathcal{F}_s$ cannot be further crossed within $\mathcal{F}_s$. First, we prove that $e_1$ and $e_2$ do not cross each other. Then, we show that $e_1$ and $e_2$ cannot be simultaneously passing through $\mathcal{F}_s$. The desired contradiction is obtained by considering two main cases: Either $e_1$ passes through $\mathcal{F}_s$ (and therefore, $e_2$ is a stick of $\mathcal{F}_s$) or both $e_1$ and $e_2$ are sticks of $\mathcal{F}_s$. □

**Lemma 11.** *Let $\mathcal{F}_s = \{v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_s\}$, $s \geq 4$ be a non-triangular face of $G_p$. Then, there are no crossings between sticks and middle parts of $\mathcal{F}_s$.*

*Proof.* Assume to the contrary that there exists a stick, say of edge $(v_1, v_1')$ that emanates from vertex $v_1$ of $\mathcal{F}_s$ (towards $v_1'$), which is crossed by a middle part of $(u, u')$ of $\mathcal{F}_s$. By Lemma 10, this stick cannot have another crossing within $\mathcal{F}_s$. By Lemma 5, we can assume w.l.o.g. that $(v_1, v_1')$ is a right stick, i.e., $(v_1, v_1')$ crosses $(v_2, v_3)$. By Lemma 4, edge $(u, u')$ crosses two consecutive edges of $\mathcal{F}_s$. We distinguish two cases based on whether $(v_1, v_1')$ crosses $(v_s, v_1)$ and $(v_1, v_2)$ of $\mathcal{F}_s$ or $(v_1, v_1')$ crosses $(v_1, v_2)$ and $(v_2, v_3)$ of $\mathcal{F}_s$; see Figures 4a and 4c respectively.

In the first case, we can assume w.l.o.g. that $u$ is the vertex associated with $(v_1, v_2)$, while $u'$ is the one associated with $(v_s, v_1)$. Hence, there exists an edge, say $f_1$, that crosses $(v_1, v_2)$ to the right of $(u, u')$, as otherwise we could replace $(u, u')$ with stick $(v_2, u')$ and reduce the total number of crossings by one, contradicting the crossing minimality of $G$. Edge $f_1$ passes through $\mathcal{F}_s$ and also crosses




**Fig. 5.** Different configurations used in (a)-(b) Lemma 12 and (c)-(d) Lemma 13.

edge $(v_2, v_3)$ above $(v_1, v_1')$. Similarly, there exists an edge $f_2$ that crosses $(v_2, v_3)$ below $(v_1, v_1')$, as otherwise replacing $(v_1, v_1')$ with chord $(v_1, v_3)$ would contradict the maximality of $G_p$. We proceed by removing edges $(u, u')$ and $f_2$ from $G$ and by replacing them with $(v_3, u)$ and chord $(v_1, v_3)$; see Figure 4b. The maximal planar substructure of the derived graph is larger than $G_p$; a contradiction.

In the second case, we assume that $u$ is associated with $(v_1, v_2)$ and $u'$ with $(v_2, v_3)$; see Figure 4c. In this scenario, there exists an edge, say $f$, that crosses $(v_2, v_3)$ below $(v_1, v_1')$, as otherwise we could replace $(v_1, v_1')$ with chord $(v_1, v_3)$, contradicting the maximality of $G_p$. If $(v_1, u')$ does not belong to $G$, then we remove $(u, u')$ from $G$ and replace it with stick $(v_1, u')$; see Figure 4d. In this way, the derived graph has fewer crossings than $G$; a contradiction. Note that $(v_1, v_1')$ and $(v_1, u')$ cannot be homotopic (if $v_1' = u'$), as otherwise edge $(v_1, v_1')$ and $(u, u')$ would not cross in the initial configuration. Hence, edge $(v_1, u')$ already exists in $G$. In this case, $f$ is identified with $(v_1, u')$; see Figure 4e. But, in this case $f$ is an uncrossed stick of $\mathcal{F}_s$, contradicting Lemma 3. □

**Lemma 12.** *Let $\mathcal{F}_s = \{v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_s\}$, $s \geq 4$ be a non-triangular face of $G_p$. Then, any stick of $\mathcal{F}_s$ is only crossed by some opposite stick of $\mathcal{F}_s$.*

*Proof.* By Lemma 5, each stick of $\mathcal{F}_s$ is short. By Lemma 10, each stick of $\mathcal{F}_s$ is crossed exactly once within $\mathcal{F}_s$ and this crossing is not with a middle part due to Lemma 11. For a proof by contradiction, consider two crossing sticks that are not opposite and assume w.l.o.g. that the first stick emanates from vertex $v_1$ (towards vertex $v_1'$) and crosses edge $(v_2, v_3)$, while the second stick emanates from vertex $v_2$ (towards vertex $v_2'$) and crosses edge $(v_3, v_4)$; see Figure 5a.

If we can replace $(v_1, v_1')$ with the chord $(v_1, v_3)$, then the maximal planar substructure of the derived graph would have more edges than $G_p$; contradicting the maximality of $G_p$. Thus, there exists an edge, say $e$, that crosses $(v_2, v_3)$ below $(v_1, v_1')$. By Lemma 11, edge $e$ is passing through $\mathcal{F}_s$. Symmetrically, we can prove that there exists an edge, say $e'$, which crosses $(v_3, v_4)$ right next to $v_4$, that is, $e'$ defines the closest crossing point to $v_4$ along $(v_3, v_4)$. Note that $e'$ can be either a passing through edge or a stick of $\mathcal{F}_s$. We proceed by removing from $G$ edges $e'$ and $(v_1, v_1')$ and by replacing them by the chord $(v_2, v_4)$ and edge $(v_4, v_1')$; see Figure 5b. The maximal planar substructure of the derived graph has more edges than $G_p$ (in the presence of edge $(v_2, v_4)$), a contradiction. □




**Fig. 6.** Different configurations used in Theorem 2.

**Lemma 13.** *Let $\mathcal{F}_s = \{v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_s\}$, $s \geq 4$ be a non-triangular face of $G_p$. Then, $\mathcal{F}_s$ has exactly two sticks.*

*Proof.* By Lemmas 8 and 12 there exists at least one pair of opposite crossing sticks. To prove the uniqueness, assume that $\mathcal{F}_s$ has two pairs of crossing opposite sticks, say $(v_1, v_1')$, $(v_2, v_2')$ and $(v_i, v_i')$, $(v_{i+1}, v_{i+1}')$, $2 < i < s$; see Figure 5c. We remove edges $(v_2, v_2')$ and $(v_i, v_i')$ and replace them by $(v_1, v_i)$ and $(v_2, v_{i+1})$; see Figure 5d. By Lemmas 4 and 5, the newly introduced edges cannot be involved in crossings. The maximal planar substructure of the derived graph has more edges than $G_p$ (in the presence of $(v_1, v_i)$ or $(v_2, v_{i+1})$); a contradiction. □

We are ready to state the main theorem of this section.

**Theorem 2.** *The planar substructure $G_p$ of a crossing-minimal optimal 3-planar graph $G$ is fully triangulated.*

*Proof.* For a proof by contradiction, assume that $G_p$ has a non-triangular face $\mathcal{F}_s = \{v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_s\}$, $s \geq 4$. By Lemmas 10, 12 and 13, face $\mathcal{F}_s$ has exactly two opposite sticks, that cross each other. Assume w.l.o.g. that these two sticks emanate from $v_1$ and $v_2$ (towards $v_1'$ and $v_2'$) and exit $\mathcal{F}_s$ by crossing $(v_2, v_3)$ and $(v_1, v_s)$, respectively; recall that by Lemma 5 all sticks are short; see Figure 6a.

If we can replace $(v_1, v_1')$ with the chord $(v_1, v_3)$, then the maximal planar substructure of the derived graph would have more edges than $G_p$; contradicting the maximality of $G_p$. Thus, there exists an edge, say $e$, that crosses $(v_2, v_3)$ below $(v_1, v_1')$. By Lemma 13, edge $e$ is passing through $\mathcal{F}_s$. We consider two cases:(a) edge $(v_2, v_3)$ is only crossed by $e$ and $(v_1, v_1')$, (b) there is a third edge, say $e'$, that crosses $(v_2, v_3)$ (which by Lemma 13 is also passing through $\mathcal{F}_s$).

In Case (a), we can remove from $G$ edges $e$ and $(v_1, v_1')$, and replace them by $(v_1, v_3)$ and the edge from $v_2$ to the endpoint of $e$ that is below $(v_3, v_4)$; see Figure 6b. In Case (b), there has to be a (passing through) edge, say $e''$, surrounding $v_4$ (see Figure 6c), as otherwise we could replace $e'$ with a stick emanating from $v_4$ towards the endpoint of $e'$ that is to the right of $(v_2, v_3)$, which contradicts Lemma 13. We proceed by removing from $G$ edges $e''$ and $(v_1, v_1')$ and by replacing them by $(v_2, v_4)$ and the edge from $v_2$ to the endpoint of $e''$ that is associated with $(v_3, v_4)$; see Figure 6d. The maximal planar substructure of the derived graph has more edges than $G_p$ (in the presence of $(v_1, v_2)$ in Case (a) and $(v_2, v_4)$ in Case (b)), which contradicts the maximality of $G_p$. Since $G_p$ is connected, there cannot exist a face consisting of only two vertices. □

## 5 Discussion and Conclusion

This paper establishes a tight upper bound on the number of edges of non-simple 3-planar graphs containing no homotopic parallel edges or self-loops. Our work is towards a complete characterization of all optimal such graphs. In addition, we believe that our technique can be used to achieve better bounds for larger values of $k$. We demonstrate it for the case where $k = 4$, where the known bound for simple graphs is due to Ackerman [1].

If we could prove that a crossing-minimal optimal 4-planar graph $G = (V, E)$ has always a fully triangulated planar substructure $G_p = (V, E_p)$ (as we proved in Theorem 2 for the corresponding 3-planar ones), then it is not difficult to prove a tight bound on the number of edges for 4-planar graphs. Similar to Lemma 1, we can argue that no triangle of $G_p$ has more than 4 sticks. Then, we associate each triangle of $G_p$ with 4 sticks to a neighboring triangle with at most 2 sticks. This would imply $t_4 \leq t_1 + t_2$, where $t_i$ denotes the number of triangles of $G_p$ with exactly $i$ sticks. So, we would have $|E| - |E_p| = (4t_4 + 3t_3 + 2t_2 + t_1)/2 \leq 3(t_4 + t_3 + t_2 + t_1)/2 = 3(2n - 4)/2 = 3n - 6$. Hence, the number of edges of a 4-planar graph $G$ is at most $6n - 12$. We conclude with some open questions.

- A nice consequence of our work would be the complete characterization of optimal 3-planar graphs, as exactly those graphs that admit drawings where the set of crossing-free edges form hexagonal faces which contain 8 additional edges each
- We also believe that for simple 3-planar graphs (i.e., where even non-homotopic parallel edges are not allowed) the corresponding bound is $5.5n - 15$.
- We conjecture that the maximum number of edges of 5- and 6-planar graphs are $\frac{19}{3}n - O(1)$ and $7n - 14$, respectively.
- More generally, is there a closed function on $k$ which describes the maximum number of edges of a $k$-planar graph for $k > 3$? Recall the general upper bound of $4.1208\sqrt{k}n$ by Pach and Tóth [19].

*Acknowledgment:* We thank E. Ackerman for bringing to our attention [1] and [18].

## References

1. Ackerman, E.: On topological graphs with at most four crossings per edge. CoRR abs/1509.01932 (2015)
2. Agarwal, P.K., Aronov, B., Pach, J., Pollack, R., Sharir, M.: Quasi-planar graphs have a linear number of edges. Combinatorica 17(1), 1–9 (1997)
3. Auer, C., Brandenburg, F., Gleißner, A., Hanauer, K.: On sparse maximal 2-planar graphs. In: Didimo, W., Patrignani, M. (eds.) GD. LNCS, vol. 7704, pp. 555–556. Springer (2012)
4. Bekos, M.A., Bruckdorfer, T., Kaufmann, M., Raftopoulou, C.N.: 1-planar graphs have constant book thickness. In: Bansal, N., Finocchi, I. (eds.) ESA. LNCS, vol. 9294, pp. 130–141. Springer (2015)
5. Borodin, O.V.: A new proof of the 6 color theorem. J. of Graph Theory 19(4), 507–521 (1995)

6. Brandenburg, F.J.: 1-visibility representations of 1-planar graphs. J. Graph Algorithms Appl. 18(3), 421–438 (2014)
7. Brandenburg, F.J., Eppstein, D., Gleißner, A., Goodrich, M.T., Hanauer, K., Reislhuber, J.: On the density of maximal 1-planar graphs. In: Didimo, W., Patrignani, M. (eds.) GD. LNCS, vol. 7704, pp. 327–338. Springer (2012)
8. Cheong, O., Har-Peled, S., Kim, H., Kim, H.: On the number of edges of fan-crossing free graphs. In: Cai, L., Cheng, S., Lam, T.W. (eds.) ISAAC. LNCS, vol. 8283, pp. 163–173. Springer (2013)
9. Di Battista, G., Eades, P., Tamassia, R., Tollis, I.G.: Graph Drawing: Algorithms for the Visualization of Graphs. Prentice-Hall (1999)
10. Didimo, W., Eades, P., Liotta, G.: Drawing graphs with right angle crossings. Theoretical Computer Science 412(39), 5156–5166 (2011)
11. Dujmovic, V., Gudmundsson, J., Morin, P., Wolle, T.: Notes on large angle crossing graphs. Chicago J. Theor. Comput. Sci. 2011 (2011)
12. de Fraysseix, H., Pach, J., Pollack, R.: How to draw a planar graph on a grid. Combinatorica 10(1), 41–51 (1990)
13. Grigoriev, A., Bodlaender, H.L.: Algorithms for graphs embeddable with few crossings per edge. Algorithmica 49(1), 1–11 (2007)
14. Harary, F.: Graph theory. Addison-Wesley (1991)
15. Hong, S., Nagamochi, H.: Testing full outer-2-planarity in linear time. In: Mayr, E.W. (ed.) WG. LNCS, vol. 9224, pp. 406–421. Springer (2015)
16. Kaufmann, M., Ueckerdt, T.: The density of fan-planar graphs. CoRR abs/1403.6184 (2014)
17. Kaufmann, M., Wagner, D. (eds.): Drawing Graphs, Methods and Models, LNCS, vol. 2025. Springer (2001)
18. Pach, J., Radoicic, R., Tardos, G., Tóth, G.: Improving the crossing lemma by finding more crossings in sparse graphs. Discrete & Computational Geometry 36(4), 527–552 (2006)
19. Pach, J., Tóth, G.: Graphs drawn with few crossings per edge. Combinatorica 17(3), 427–439 (1997)
20. Ringel, G.: Ein sechsfarbenproblem auf der kugel. Abhandlungen aus dem Mathematischen Seminar der Universität Hamburg (in German) 29, 107–117 (1965)
21. Tamassia, R.: On embedding a graph in the grid with the minimum number of bends. SIAM J. Comput. 16(3), 421–444 (1987)
22. Tutte, W.T.: How to draw a graph. Proc. London Math. Soc. 3(13), 743–767 (1963)

# Appendix

## A A class of 3-planar graphs with 5.5n–11 edges

In this section, we demonstrate an infinite class of 3-planar graphs with $n$ vertices and exactly $\frac{11n}{2} - 11$ edges.

**Theorem 3.** *There exist infinitely many 3-planar graphs with $n$ vertices and $\frac{11n}{2} - 11$ edges.*

*Proof.* Let $n \geq 6$ be a positive integer, such that $n-2$ is divisible by 4. Figure 7a illustrates an auxiliary plane graph $H$ with $n$ vertices, $\frac{3(n-2)}{2}$ edges and $\frac{n-2}{2}$ faces of size 6. In Figure 7b, we demonstrate how one can embed 8 edges in the interior of a face of size 6, so that no interior edge is crossed more than three times. This implies that if we embed this way 8 edges in every face of $H$, we will obtain a 3-planar graph with $n$ vertices and exactly $\frac{3(n-2)}{2} + 8 \cdot \frac{n-2}{2} = \frac{11n}{2} - 11$ edges. □




**Fig. 7.** Illustration of (a) the auxiliary plane graph $H$, and (b) how to embed 8 edges in a face of size 6.

## B Detailed Proofs from Section 4

**Lemma 3**. *Let $\mathcal{F}_s = \{v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_s\}$, $s \geq 4$ be a non-triangular face of $G_p$. Then, each stick of $\mathcal{F}_s$ is crossed at least once within $\mathcal{F}_s$.*

*Proof.* Recall that a stick is the part of an edge from one of its endpoints towards to the nearest crossing-point with an edge of $G_p$. Hence, a stick can potentially be further crossed within a face of $G_p$, i.e., either by another stick or by a middle part of an edge that passes through this face. Assume to the contrary that there exists a stick of $\mathcal{F}_s$ that is not crossed within $\mathcal{F}_s$. W.l.o.g. let $(v_1, v_1')$ be the edge containing this stick and assume that $(v_1, v_1')$ emanates from vertex $v_1$ and leads to vertex $v_1'$ by crossing the edge $(v_i, v_{i+1})$ of $\mathcal{F}_s$. Note that, in general, $v_1'$ can also be a vertex of $\mathcal{F}_s$. For simplicity, we will assume that $(v_1, v_1')$ is drawn as a vertical line segment with $v_i$ to the right of $(v_1, v_1')$ and $v_{i+1}$ to the left of $(v_1, v_1')$




**Fig. 8.** Different configurations used in Lemma 3. Black edges belong to $G_p$. Blue and red edges correspond to sticks and middle parts of $\mathcal{F}_s$. Green dashed ones are sticks or middle parts of $\mathcal{F}_s$.

as in Figure 8a. Since $\mathcal{F}_s$ is not triangular, it follows that $i \neq 2$ or $i+1 \neq s$. Assume w.l.o.g. that $i \neq 2$.

We initially prove that $i+1 = s$. First observe that if we can replace $(v_1, v'_1)$ with the chord $(v_1, v_i)$, then the maximal planar substructure of the derived graph would have more edges than $G_p$; contradicting the maximality of $G_p$. We make a remark here[4]. Edge $(v_1, v_i)$ potentially exists in $G$ either as part of its planar substructure $G_p$ (because $\mathcal{F}_s$ is not necessarily simple) or as part of $G - G_p$. In the later case, the existence of $(v_1, v_i)$ in $G - G_p$ would deviate the maximality of $G_p$ (as we showed that $(v_1, v_i)$ can be part of $G_p$); a contradiction. In the former case, if chord $(v_1, v_i)$ that we introduced is homotopic to an existing copy of $(v_1, v_i)$ in $G_p$, then $i = 2$ must hold; a contradiction. Hence, there exists an edge, say $e_1$, that crosses $(v_i, v_{i+1})$ to the right of $(v_1, v'_1)$.

Similarly, if we can replace $e_1$ with the chord $(v_1, v_i)$, then again the maximal planar substructure of the derived graph would have more edges than $G_p$; again contradicting the maximality of $G_p$. Thus, there also exists a second edge, say $e_2$, that crosses $(v_i, v_{i+1})$ to the right of $e_1$. If $i+1 \neq s$, then a symmetric argument would imply that $(v_i, v_{i+1})$ has five crossings; a clear contradiction. Hence, $s = i+1$; see Figure 8b.

We now claim that $e_1$ is not a stick emanating from $v_1$. For a contradiction, assume that $e_1$ is indeed a stick from $v_1$. Then, we could replace $e_2$ with the chord $(v_1, v_{s-1})$, and therefore obtain a graph whose maximal planar substructure has more edges than $G_p$; contradicting the maximality of $G_p$. Similarly, $e_2$ is not a stick from $v_1$ (by their definition, $e_1$ and $e_2$ are not sticks from $v_s$, either).

We now claim that we can remove edges $e_1$, $e_2$ and $(v_1, v'_1)$ from $G$ and replace them with the chord $(v_1, v_{s-1})$ and two additional edges that are both sticks either at $v_1$ or at $v_s$, as illustrated in Figures 8c and 8d, respectively. Indeed, if both configurations are not possible, then $e_1$ and $e_2$ are homotopic. Hence, we have obtained a new graph, whose maximal planar substructure has more edges than $G_p$, which contradicts the maximality of $G_p$. □

**Lemma 4.** *Let $\mathcal{F}_s = \{v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_s\}$, $s \geq 4$ be a non-triangular face of $G_p$. Then, each middle part of $\mathcal{F}_s$ is short, i.e., it crosses consecutive edges of $\mathcal{F}_s$.*

[4] This remark will be implicitly used whenever we replace an existing edge of $G$ with another one (and not explicitly stated again), throughout this section.




**Fig. 9.** Different configurations used in Lemma 4.

*Proof.* For a proof by contradiction, assume that $(u, u')$ is an edge that defines a middle part of $\mathcal{F}_s$ which crosses two non-consecutive edges of $\mathcal{F}_s$, say w.l.o.g. $(v_1, v_2)$ and $(v_i, v_{i+1})$, where $i \neq 2$ and $i + 1 \neq s$. As in the proof of Lemma 3, we will assume for simplicity that $(u, u')$ is drawn as a vertical line-segment, while $(v_1, v_2)$ and $(v_i, v_{i+1})$ as horizontal ones, such that $v_1$ and $v_{i+1}$ are to the left of $(u, u')$ and $v_2$ and $v_i$ to its right. Note that this might be an oversimplification, if e.g., $v_1$ is identical to $v_{i+1}$. Clearly, each of $(v_1, v_2)$ and $(v_i, v_{i+1})$ are crossed by at most two other edges. Let $e_1$, $e'_1$ be the edges that potentially cross $(v_1, v_2)$ and $e_2$, $e'_2$ the ones that potentially cross $(v_i, v_{i+1})$. Note that we do not make any assumption in the order in which these edges cross $(v_1, v_2)$ and $(v_i, v_{i+1})$ w.r.t. the edge $(u, u')$; see Figure 9a. Note also that neither $e_1$ nor $e'_1$ can have more than one crossing above $(v_1, v_2)$, as otherwise they would form sticks of $\mathcal{F}_s$ that are not crossed within $\mathcal{F}_s$, which would lead to a contradiction with Lemma 3. Similarly, $e_2$ and $e'_2$ cannot have more than one crossing below $(v_i, v_{i+1})$.

First, we consider the case where $(u, u')$ is not involved in crossings in the interior of $\mathcal{F}_s$. Hence, $(u, u')$ can have at most one additional crossing, either above $(v_1, v'_1)$ or below $(v_i, v_{i+1})$, say w.l.o.g. below $(v_i, v_{i+1})$. In this case, we remove edges $(u, u')$, $e_1$, $e'_1$, $e_2$ and $e'_2$ from $G$ and we replace them by the following edges (see also Figure 9b): (a) the edge from $u$ to $v_i$, (b) the edge from $u$ to $v_{i+1}$, (c) the edge from $v_1$ to the endpoint below $(v_i, v_{i+1})$ of the removed edge that used to cross $(v_i, v_{i+1})$ leftmost, (d) the edge from $v_2$ to the endpoint below $(v_i, v_{i+1})$ of the removed edge that used to cross $(v_i, v_{i+1})$ rightmost, (e) the edge from $u$ to the endpoint below $(v_i, v_{i+1})$ of the remaining removed edge that used to cross $(v_i, v_{i+1})$. Observe that the maximal planar substructure of the derived graph has more edges than $G_p$, since it contains edges $(u, v_i)$ and $(u, v_{i+1})$, instead of edge $(v_1, v_2)$, which contradicts the maximality of $G_p$.

To complete the proof, it remains to lead to a contradiction the case where $(u, u')$ is crossed by an edge, say $e$, within $\mathcal{F}_s$; see Figure 9c. Observe that edge $(u, u')$ can be crossed neither above $(v_1, v'_1)$ nor below $(v_i, v_{i+1})$. We proceed to remove $e$, $e_1$, $e'_1$, $e_2$ and $e'_2$ from $G$ and we replace them by the edges $(v_2, v_{i+1})$, $(u, v_{i+1})$, $(u, v_i)$, $(u', v_1)$ and $(u', v_2)$, respectively; see Figure 9d. The planar substructure of the derived graph has more edges than $G_p$; a contradiction. □

**Lemma 8**. *Let $\mathcal{F}_s = \{v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_s\}$, $s \geq 4$ be a non-triangular face of $G_p$. Then, $\mathcal{F}_s$ has at least one stick.*

*Proof.* For a proof by contradiction, assume that $\mathcal{F}_s$ has no sticks. By Lemma 7, it follows that there exist at least two incident edges of $\overline{br}(\mathcal{F}_s)$ that are crossed by passing through edges of $\mathcal{F}_s$, say w.l.o.g. $(v_s, v_1)$ and $(v_1, v_2)$. Note that these two edges are not bridges of $\mathcal{F}_s$. We remove all passing through edges of $\mathcal{F}_s$ and we add several new edges in $\mathcal{F}_s$; see also Figure 10a. As in the proof of Lemma 7, we introduce $s-3$ edges $\{(v_1, v_i) : 2 < i < s\}$ that lie completely in the interior of $\mathcal{F}_s$. Let $e_i = (v_i, v_{i+1})$, $2 < i < s$ be an edge of $\overline{br}(\mathcal{F}_s)$, other than $(v_s, v_1)$ and $(v_1, v_2)$, that was crossed by a passing through edge of $\mathcal{F}_s$. Let also $u_i$ be the vertex associated with this particular edge. Then, we can introduce edge $(v_1, u_i)$ in $G$ by maintaining 3-planarity as follows: we draw this edge starting from $v_1$ and between edges $(v_1, v_i)$ and $(v_1, v_{i+1})$, towards the crossing point along $e_i$ and then we follow the part of the passing through edge associated with $e_i$ towards $u_i$. Hence, potential parallel edges are not homotopic. In the same way, we introduce two more edges starting from $v_3$ and $v_{s-1}$ towards to the two vertices associated with $(v_1, v_2)$ and $(v_1, v_s)$, respectively (recall that both $(v_1, v_2)$ and $(v_1, v_s)$ were initially involved in crossings).

Since $\widehat{s_b}$ is the number of edges of $\overline{br}(\mathcal{F}_s)$ that initially were not crossed by any passing through edge of $\mathcal{F}_s$, in total we have introduced $s-3+\overline{s_b}-\widehat{s_b}$ edges (recall that $s = 2s_b + \overline{s_b}$). Since every edge of $\overline{br}(\mathcal{F}_s)$ can be crossed at most three times and each passing through edge of $\mathcal{F}_s$ crosses two edges of $\overline{br}(\mathcal{F}_s)$, it follows that initially we removed at most $\lfloor \frac{3}{2}(\overline{s_b} - \widehat{s_b}) \rfloor$ edges. This implies that as long as $s + \widehat{s_b} + 2s_b \geq 6$, the resulting graph is larger or of equal size as $G$ but with larger planar substructure. In the case where $s + \widehat{s_b} + 2s_b = 5$ (that is, $s = 5$ and $\widehat{s_b} = s_b = 0$ or $s = 4$, $\widehat{s_b} = 1$ and $s_b = 0$), the resulting graph is again of equal size as $G$ but with larger planar substructure. Both cases, of course, contradict either the optimality of $G$ of the maximality of $G_p$.

To complete the proof of this lemma, it remains to lead to a contradiction the case, where $s + \widehat{s_b} + 2s_b = 4$. Since $\mathcal{F}_s$ is not triangular, $s = 4$ and $\widehat{s_b} = s_b = 0$ follows. Recall that in this case $\mathcal{F}_s$ initially consisted of four edges, each of which was crossed exactly three times by some passing through edges (out of six in total). Let $R_i$ be the set of all possible vertices that can be associated with $(v_i, v_{i+1})$, $i = 1, \ldots, 4$. Clearly, $1 \leq |R_i| \leq 3$. Let also $u_i$ be a vertex of $R_i$. By Lemma 4 it follows that all passing through edges with an endpoint in $R_i$ have their other endpoint in $R_{i+1}$ or in $R_{i-1}$. Suppose first, for some $i = 1, \ldots, 4$, that all passing through edges with an endpoint in $R_i$ have their other endpoint in $R_{i+1}$ and not in $R_{i-1}$. In this scenario, however, it is clear that edge $(v_i, v_{i+2})$ can be safely added to $G$ without destroying its 3-planarity, which of course contradicts the optimality of $G$ (see Figure 10b). Hence, for every $i = 1, \ldots, 4$ there exists a passing through edge with an endpoint in $R_i$ and its other endpoint in $R_{i+1}$. To cope with this case, we replace all passing through edges of $\mathcal{F}_s$ with the edges of the configuration illustrated either in Figure 10c or 10d. Both configurations are suitable in this case. Additionally, the presence of $(v_2, v_4)$ or $(v_1, v_3)$, respectively, leads to a contradiction the maximality of the planar substructure. Observe that edges $(u_1, u_3)$ and $(u_2, u_4)$ are both involved in three crossings each. This implies that both configurations might be forbidden (due to




**Fig. 10.** Different configurations used in Lemma 8.

3-planarity), in the case where all passing through edges that initially emanated, say w.l.o.g. from each vertex of $R_1$ and each vertex of $R_2$, had crossings outside $\mathcal{F}_s$. This implies, however, that initially there was no passing through edge of $\mathcal{F}_s$ from a vertex of $R_1$ to a vertex of $R_2$ (as such an edge would have four crossings); a contradiction. □

**Lemma 10**. *Let $\mathcal{F}_s = \{v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_s\}$, $s \geq 4$ be a non-triangular face of $G_p$. Then, each stick of $\mathcal{F}_s$ is crossed exactly once within $\mathcal{F}_s$.*

*Proof.* By Lemma 3, each stick of $\mathcal{F}_s$ is crossed at least once within $\mathcal{F}_s$. For a proof by contradiction, assume that there exists a stick of $\mathcal{F}_s$ that is crossed twice within $\mathcal{F}_s$ (by edges $e_1$ and $e_2$; see Figure 11a). W.l.o.g. let $(v_1, v_1')$ be the edge containing this stick and assume that $(v_1, v_1')$ emanates from vertex $v_1$ and leads to vertex $v_1'$ by crossing the edge $(v_2, v_3)$ of $\mathcal{F}_s$, that is, $(v_1, v_1')$ forms a right stick of $\mathcal{F}_s$ (recall that by Lemma 5, each stick of $\mathcal{F}_s$ is short).

First, we show that $e_1$ and $e_2$ cannot cross in $\mathcal{F}_s$. Assume to the contrary that this is not the case, namely, $e_1$ crosses $e_2$ in $\mathcal{F}_s$; see Figure 11a. Since $e$, $e_1$ and $e_2$ mutually cross in $\mathcal{F}_s$, both $e_1$ and $e_2$ have two crossings within $\mathcal{F}_s$. It follows that neither $e_1$ nor $e_2$ passes through $\mathcal{F}_s$, or equivalently, that both $e_1$ and $e_2$ form sticks of $\mathcal{F}_s$. This, however, contradicts Lemma 9, as $e$, $e_1$ and $e_2$ define three mutually crossing sticks of $\mathcal{F}_s$. Before we continue, we make two useful remarks:

R.1. Let $\mathcal{F}'$ be the face of $G_p$ that shares edge $(v_2, v_3)$ with $\mathcal{F}_s$. Since $e$ has already three crossings within $\mathcal{F}_s$, it follows that $v_1'$ is a vertex of $\mathcal{F}'$. For face $\mathcal{F}'$, edge $e$ forms an uncrossed stick. Hence, $\mathcal{F}'$ is triangular and $\mathcal{F}' \neq \mathcal{F}_s$ (refer to the gray-colored face of Figure 11a).

R.2. Assume that either $e_1$ or $e_2$, say w.l.o.g. $e_1$, is passing through $\mathcal{F}_s$. By Lemma 4, it follows that $e_1$ is crossing either $(v_1, v_s)$ or $(v_2, v_3)$ of $\mathcal{F}_s$. We claim that $e_1$ cannot cross $(v_2, v_3)$. For a proof by contradiction, assume that this is not the case. If $e_1$ passes through $\mathcal{F}'$, then $e_1$ would have at least four crossings in the drawing of $G$; a contradiction. So, $v_1'$ is an endpoint of $e_1$. However, in this case, $e_1$ and $(v_1, v_1')$ would not cross in the initial drawing of $G$; a contradiction. Hence, $e_1$ is crossing $(v_1, v_s)$ of $\mathcal{F}_s$. Let w.l.o.g. $e_1 = (u, v)$. Arguing similarly with Remark R.1, we can show that edges $(v_1, v_s)$ and $(v_1, v_2)$ belong to two triangular faces in $G_p$ with $u$ and $w$ as third vertex, respectively (see Figure 11b). Hence, $e_2$ cannot




**Fig. 11.** Different configurations used in Lemma 10: The case where edge $e_1$ passes through $\mathcal{F}_s$.

simultaneously pass through $\mathcal{F}_s$. We distinguish two cases depending on whether $e_1$ passes through $\mathcal{F}_s$ or not.

- *Edge $e_1$ passes through $\mathcal{F}_s$*; see Figure 11b. By 3-planarity, there are at most two more edges, say $f_1$, $f_2$, that cross edge $(v_1, v_s)$ and at most two more edges, say $g_1$, $g_2$, that cross $(v_2, v_3)$. We remove these edges from $G$ as well as edges $e_1$ and $e_2$, i.e., a total of at most 6 edges, and we replace them with the edges $(u, v_2)$, $(u, v_1')$, $(u, v_3)$, $(v_1', v_s)$ $(v_1, v_3)$ and $(v_3, v_s)$; see Figure 11c. If $s > 4$ or one among $f_1$, $f_2$, $g_1$ and $g_2$ is not present in $G$, then the derived graph has at least as many edges as $G$ but its maximal planar substructure has two more edges, i.e., $(v_1, v_3)$ and $(v_3, v_s)$, contradicting the maximality of $G_p$.
  Consider now the case where edges $f_1$, $f_2$, $g_1$ and $g_2$ are present in $G$ and $s = 4$. In this case, edge $(v_3, v_s)$ exists in $G$. By 3-planarity, $f_1$ and $f_2$ cross $(v_1, v_4)$ below $e_1$. Also, at least one of $g_1$ and $g_2$, say w.l.o.g. $g_1$, crosses $(v_2, v_3)$ bellow $(v_1, v_1')$, otherwise we could replace $(v_1, v_1')$ with chord $(v_1, v_3)$, contradicting the maximality of $G_p$. The second edge $g_2$ may cross $(v_2, v_3)$ either above $(v_1, v_3)$ or below $(v_1, v_3)$; see Figure 11b.
  We claim that $e_2$ and $(v_3, v_4)$ cannot cross. For a proof by contradiction, assume that $e_2$ and $(v_3, v_4)$ cross. By 3-planarity, at most two of edges $f_1$, $f_2$ and $g_1$ can cross $(v_3, v_4)$. Thus, at least one of them is a stick crossing $e_2$. Since $e_2$ has already three crossings, it must be a stick of $v_2$. This implies that exactly two of $f_1$, $f_2$ and $g_1$ cross $(v_3, v_4)$. On the other hand, $g_2$ can cross neither $e_2$ nor $(v_3, v_4)$. Hence, $g_2$ cannot exist; a contradiction.
  Since $e_2$ and $(v_3, v_4)$ cannot cross, edge $e_2$ forms a stick emanating either from $v_3$ or from $v_4$. In the later case, $e_2$ must cross $f_1$ and $f_2$, and therefore has at least four crossings (as it also crosses $(v_1, v_1')$ and an edge of $\mathcal{F}_s$ to exit $\mathcal{F}_s$); a contradiction.
  From the above, it follows that $e_2$ forms a stick of $v_3$; see Figure 11d. In this case, $e_2$ crosses with $(v_1, v_2)$, $(v_1, v_1')$ and $g_1$ (which crosses $(v_2, v_3)$ below $(v_1, v_1')$). Since $e_2$ has already three crossings, it follows that $g_2$ crosses $(v_2, v_3)$ above $(v_1, v_1')$ and passes through $\mathcal{F}_s$. Also, $g_1$ cannot be a stick of $v_4$, as otherwise it would cross with both $f_1$ and $f_2$ having more than three crossings. So, $g_1$ crosses $(v_3, v_4)$ and passes through $\mathcal{F}_s$. Similarly to Remark R.2, we can show that $g_1$ joins vertex $v_1'$ with a vertex, say $w'$, so that

$w'$, $v_3$ and $v_4$ form a triangular face of $G_p$. It follows that vertices $v_1$, $w$, $v_2$, $v'_1$, $v_3$, $w'$, $v_4$ and $u$ form an octagon in $G_p$ with 4 edges of $G_p$ in its interior and a total of 7 more edges of $G - G_p$ that either lie entirely in the octagon or pass through the octagon. We remove these 11 edges from $G$ and replace them with the corresponding ones of Figure 11e (which lie completely in the interior of the octagon). In the derived graph, the octagon has still a total of 11 edges. However, 5 of them belong to its maximal planar substructure; a contradiction to the maximality of $G_p$.

- *Edge $e_1$ is a stick of $\mathcal{F}_s$.* In this case, both $e_1$ and $e_2$ form sticks of $\mathcal{F}_s$ (by Remark R.2). By Lemma 5 and by the fact that $e_1$ and $e_2$ cross $(v_1, v'_1)$, $e_1$ and $e_2$ emanate from $v_2$, $v_3$ or $v_s$.
  First, we will prove that neither $e_1$ nor $e_2$ forms a stick of $v_3$. For a proof by contradiction, assume that $e_2$ forms a stick of $v_3$; see Figure 12a. Since $e_1$ and $e_2$ do not cross, $e_1$ forms stick of either $v_3$ or $v_s$. In the former case, however, we can add edge $(v_1, v_3)$ to $G$, contradicting its optimality. Therefore, edge $e_1$ forms a stick of $v_s$. Edge $g_1$ crosses $(v_2, v_3)$ bellow $(v_1, v'_1)$, as otherwise we could replace $(v_1, v'_1)$ with chord $(v_1, v_3)$ contradicting the maximality of $G_p$. It follows that $g_1$ also crosses $e_2$. This implies that $g_1$ is a stick of $\mathcal{F}_s$. Since $e_2$ has three crossings, it follows that $e_2$ joins $v_3$ with a vertex, say $v'_3$, so that $v_1$, $v_2$ and $v'_3$ form a triangular face of $G_p$. By 3-planarity, the third edge $g_2$ that potentially crosses $(v_2, v_3)$ lies above $(v_1, v'_1)$ and passes through $\mathcal{F}_s$. Also by 3-planarity, there exists at most one other edge $f_1$ that crosses $e_1$ and is a stick of $\mathcal{F}_s$ (as shown in the first part of the proof). Consider now the "hexagon" defined by $v_s$ $v_1$, $v'_3$, $v_2$, $v'_1$ and $v_3$. It contains two or three edges of $G_p$ (depending on whether $s > 4$ or $s = 4$, respectively) and at most 5 other edges. We remove them from $G$ and replace them with the corresponding ones of Figure 12b. The derived graph has at least as many edges as $G$, but its planar substructure is larger than $G_p$ (due to chord $(v_1, v_3)$); a contradiction to the maximality of $G_p$. So, $e_1$ and $e_2$ are sticks of $v_2$ or $v_s$.
  Next, we will prove that $e_1$ and $e_2$ emanate from the same vertex of $\mathcal{F}_s$. For a proof by contradiction, assume that $e_1$ is a stick of $v_s$ and $e_2$ is a stick of $v_2$; see Figure 12c. By Lemma 9, edge $e_2$ crosses edge $(v_3, v_4)$ of $\mathcal{F}_s$. Now, there exists an edge $f$ that crosses $(v_1, v_2)$ to the right of $e_1$, otherwise we could replace $e_1$ with chord $(v_s, v_2)$ contradicting the maximality of $G_p$. This edge also crosses $e_2$ and $(v_2, v_3)$, that is, $f$ passes through $\mathcal{F}_s$. Then, $e_2$ is a stick of $\mathcal{F}_s$ that is crossed twice: by a stick and a passing through edge. This case however cannot occur, since it is covered by the first case of the lemma. So, $e_1$ and $e_2$ are sticks of the same vertex of $\mathcal{F}_s$.
  Next, we will prove that $e_1$ and $e_2$ do not form sticks of $v_s$; see Figure 12d. As before, there exists an edge $f_1$ that passes through $\mathcal{F}_s$ and crosses $(v_1, v_2)$ to the right of $e_2$ and $(v_2, v_3)$ above $(v_1, v'_1)$, as otherwise we could replace $e_2$ with chord $(v_s, v_2)$ contradicting the maximality of $G_p$. Similarly, there exists an edge $f_2$ that crosses $(v_2, v_3)$ bellow $(v_1, v'_1)$, as otherwise we could replace $(v_1, v'_1)$ with chord $(v_1, v_3)$ and lead to a contradiction the maximality of $G_p$. We claim that $f_2$ is an edge connecting $v_s$ with $v'_1$. First, we make the




**Fig. 12.** Different configurations used in Lemma 10: The case where edge $e_1$ forms a stick of $\mathcal{F}_s$.

following observation. Suppose that there is an edge that crosses $e_1$ and $e_2$ within $\mathcal{F}_s$. By Remark 1, $e_1$ and $e_2$ are homotopic; a contradiction. Therefore, no further edge crosses $e_1$ and $e_2$. Now, if $f_2$ is not an edge connecting $v_s$ with $v'_1$, then we can replace $(v_1, v'_1)$ with the edge $(v_s, v'_1)$ and reduce the total number of crossings of $G$ by two, which of course contradicts the crossing minimality of $G$. If $s > 4$, clearly we can add edge $(v_3, v_s)$ to $G$ and contradict its optimality. Therefore, $s = 4$ holds. In this case, $f_2$ is a stick of $\mathcal{F}_s$. Hence, by Lemma 3 $f_2$ must be crossed at least once within $\mathcal{F}_s$, which is not possible in the absence of chord $(v_1, v_3)$ because of the 3-planarity.

It remains to prove that $e_1$ and $e_2$ do not form sticks of $v_2$. Assuming that $e_2$ crosses $(v_1, v'_1)$ rightmost (among $e_1$ and $e_2$), we consider two cases: $e_2$ forms a(i) right or (ii) left stick of $\mathcal{F}_s$.

Case (i) is illustrated in Figure 12e. In this case, there exists an edge $f_1$ that crosses $(v_3, v_4)$ to the left of $e_2$, as otherwise we could replace $e_2$ with chord $(v_2, v_4)$ contradicting the maximality of $G_p$. Note that if $f_1 = e_1$, then $e_1$ can be replaced with chord $(v_2, v_4)$, again leading to a contradiction the maximality of $G_p$. Analogously, there exists an edge $f_2$ that crosses $(v_2, v_3)$ bellow $(v_1, v'_1)$, as otherwise we could replace $(v_1, v'_1)$ with chord $(v_1, v_3)$, which would contradict the maximality of $G_p$. By 3-planarity, edge $f_2$ cannot cross $e_2$. Hence, $f_2$ passes through $\mathcal{F}_s$ and crosses $(v_3, v_4)$ to the right of $e_2$. This implies that $e_1$ is a left stick and crosses $(v_1, v_s)$. We proceed by removing $(v_1, v'_1)$ and $f_1$ from $G$ and by replacing them with edge $(v_4, v'_1)$ and chord $(v_2, v_4)$; see Figure 12f. Note that this replacement is legal, since we can show (as in the case where $e_1$ and $e_2$ do not form sticks of $v_s$) that $(v_2, v_3)$ is not involved in any other crossing. The maximal planar substructure of the derived graph is larger than $G_p$; a contradiction.

Case (ii) is illustrated in Figure 12g. In this case, both $e_1$ and $e_2$ form left sticks of $v_2$. In addition, there exists an edge $f_1$ that crosses $(v_1, v_s)$ bellow

$e_2$, as otherwise we could replace $e_2$ with chord $(v_2, v_s)$ contradicting the maximality of $G_p$. In the absence of $(v_s, v'_1)$, we remove $(v_1, v'_1)$ and $f_1$ from $G$ and we replace them with $(v_s, v'_1)$ and chord $(v_2, v_s)$. The maximal planar substructure of the derived graph has more edges than $G_p$, which contradicts its maximality. Hence, $(v_s, v'_1)$ belongs to $G$; see Figure 12i. If $s > 4$, then $(v_s, v'_1)$ forms a far stick of $\mathcal{F}_s$, contradicting Lemma 5. Hence $s = 4$. In this case, we can remove $(v_2, v_3)$ from $G_p$ and add edges $(v_s, v'_1)$ and $(v_1, v'_1)$ to it, which again contradicts the maximality of $G_p$; see Figure 12j. □